

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawing sheet labeled 'New Sheet' includes new Figures 6 and 7a-7c. The new figures are added to clearly illustrate elements in claims previously presented. No new matter is introduced.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment is filed with a one month extension of time under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a).

In the specification, the paragraphs [0022], [0023], [0028] and [0034] have been amended for clarification and to correct minor editorial deficiencies. The new paragraphs [0023.1] and [0023.2] added after paragraph [0023] briefly describe new figures 6 and 7a-7c respectively.

In new drawing sheet includes new Figures 6 and 7a-7c. The new figures are added to clearly illustrate elements in claims previously presented.

Claims 1-29 remain in this application. Claims 1-29 presently stand rejected. Independent claims 1, 8 and 15, and dependent claims 12, 24 and 27 are presently amended to distinguish over each of the prior art references individually and in combinations thereof.

This paper introduces no new matter to the Applicant's original application.

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present claims in view of the previous amendments and following remarks.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant amended independent claim 8 to correct the grammatical error and dependent claims 9-14 are presently corrected by virtue of their dependence on amended claim 8.

Claims 21, 24 and 27 are misdescriptive since the retainer is not secured to the fastener. The examiner kindly pointed out that the retainer is secured to the holder. Applicant amended each of claims 21, 24 and 27 to correctly identify the retainer position.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a or e).

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 12, 14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a or e) as being clearly anticipated by Rinner, et al US 6,543,317 (Rinner). The Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a or e) are hereinafter traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

The applicant's independent claims 1 and 8 are presently amended to distinguish over Rinner. The, "...retainer [63] provides a bias force to said at least one point to retain said fastener [F] against the holder [50]". It is known in the art of mechanical assembly that a threaded fastener contains a shank portion and an expanded head portion. The head portion contains one or more points, alternating with one or more flats about a periphery of the head. *The applicant's present invention applies a bias force to the fastener head at the points only and not the flats or the shank portion.* The amendment is supported by paragraph [0031] and Figures 5a and 5b of the applicant's original application. Rinner applies a bias force only to the shank portion (13) of the fastener with integral tangs (31).

Claims 5, 7, 12, 14 and 22 are also allowable by virtue of their dependence from independent claims 1 and 8.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a).

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hubbard US 2,798,394 (Hubbard) in view of Rinner. The Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) are hereinafter traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

The applicant's independent claims 1 and 8 are presently amended to include the limitation that, "...retainer [63] provides a bias force to said at least one point to retain said fastener [F] against the holder [50]". Neither Hubbard nor Rinner alone or in combination teach, show or suggest retaining a fastener by providing a bias force to the head of the fastener at the points. Hubbard Figure 3 shows a bias force being applied to the head of the fastener at the flats and Rinner Figure 9 shows a bias force being applied to the fastener shank and not the head. Claims 2-3, 5, 7, 9-10 and 14 depend from amended claims 1 and 8 and presently distinguish over the combination of Hubbard and Rinner as well.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faso US 3,142,211 (Faso) or Fogal US 2,805,594 in view of Rinner. The Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) are hereinafter traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

The applicant's independent claims 1 and 8 are presently amended to include the limitation that, "...retainer [63] provides a bias force to said at least one point to retain said fastener [F] against the holder [50]". Neither Faso, Fogal nor Rinner alone or in combination teach, show or suggest retaining a fastener by providing a bias force to the head of the fastener at the points. Faso Figures 2 and 4 and Fogal Figures 4, 5 and 6 show

a bias force being applied to the head of the fastener at the flats and not the points. Rinner Figure 9 shows a bias force being applied to the fastener shank and not the head. Claims 4, 5, 11 and 12 depend from amended claims 1 and 8 and presently distinguish over the combination of Faso, Fogal and Rinner as well.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGuckin US 1, 558, 267 (McGuckin) in view of Rinner. The Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) are hereinafter traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

The applicant's independent claims 1 and 8 are presently amended to include the limitation that, "...retainer [63] provides a bias force to said at least one point to retain said fastener [F] against the holder [50]". Neither McGuckin nor Rinner alone or in combination teach, show or suggest retaining a fastener by providing a bias force to the head of the fastener at the points. McGuckin Figures 1 -3 show a bias force being applied to the head of the fastener at the flats and not the points. Rinner Figure 9 shows a bias force being applied to the fastener shank and not the head. Claims 5, 6 and 8 depend from amended claims 1 and 8 and presently distinguish over the combination of McGuckin and Rinner as well.

Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faso in view of Rinner. The Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) are hereinafter traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

The applicant's independent claim 15 is presently amended to include the limitation that, "...an arm [67] contacting the at least one point to force the fastener [F] against the holder [50]". Neither Faso nor Rinner alone or in combination teach, show or suggest retaining a fastener by providing a bias force to the head of the fastener at the points. Faso Figures 2 and 4 show a bias force being applied to the head of the fastener at the flats and not the points. Rinner Figure 9 shows a bias force being applied to the

fastener shank and not the head. Claims 15-20 depend from amended claim 15 and presently distinguish over the combination of Faso and Rinner as well.

Claims 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinner in view of Cuda US 4,923,272 (Cuda). The Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) are hereinafter traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

The applicant's independent claims 1 and 8 are presently amended to include the limitation that, "...retainer [63] provides a bias force to said at least one point to retain said fastener [F] against the holder [50]". Neither Rinner nor Cuda alone or in combination teach, show or suggest retaining a fastener by providing a bias force to the head of the fastener at the points. Rinner Figure 9 shows a bias force being applied to the head of the fastener at the flats and not the points. Cuda discusses welding a retainer clip to a fiber optic cable connector to retain a male portion by engaging a circumferential slot. Claims 21 and 24 depend from amended claims 1 and 8 and presently distinguish over the combination of Rinner and Cuda as well.

Claims 22-23 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faso or Fogal in view of Rinner and further in view of Ritchey US 5, 628, 549 (Ritchey) The Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) are hereinafter traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

The applicant's independent claims 1 and 8 are presently amended to include the limitation that, "...retainer [63] provides a bias force to said at least one point to retain said fastener [F] against the holder [50]". Neither Faso, Fogal, Rinner nor Ritchey alone or in combination teach, show or suggest retaining a fastener by providing a bias force to the head of the fastener at the points. Faso Figures 2 and 4, Fogal Figures 4, 5 and 6 and Rinner Figure 9 show a bias force being applied to the head of the fastener at the flats and not the points. Ritchey discusses a retainer clip with a noncircular cross section. Claims

22-23 and 25-26 depend from amended claims 1 and 8 and presently distinguish over the combination of Faso, Fogal, Rinner and Ritchey as well.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faso view of Rinner and further in view of Cuda. The Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) are hereinafter traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

The applicant's independent claim 15 is presently amended to include the limitation that, "...an arm [67] contacting the at least one point to force the fastener [F] against the holder [50]". Neither Faso, Rinner nor Cuda alone or in combination teach, show or suggest retaining a fastener by providing a bias force to the head of the fastener at the points. Faso Figures 2 and 4 show a bias force being applied to the head of the fastener at the flats and not the points. Rinner Figure 9 shows a bias force being applied to the fastener shank and not the head. Cuda discusses welding a retainer clip to a fiber optic cable connector to retain a male portion by engaging a circumferential slot. Claim 27 depends from amended claim 15 and presently distinguishes over the combination of Faso, Rinner and Cuda as well.

Claims 28-29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faso view of Rinner and further in view of Ritchey. The Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) are hereinafter traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

The applicant's independent claim 15 is presently amended to include the limitation that, "...an arm [67] contacting the at least one point to force the fastener [F] against the holder [50]". Neither Faso, Rinner nor Ritchey alone or in combination teach, show or suggest retaining a fastener by providing a bias force to the head of the fastener at the points. Faso Figures 2 and 4 show a bias force being applied to the head of the fastener at the flats and not the points. Rinner Figure 9 shows a bias force being applied

to the fastener shank and not the head. Ritchey discusses a retainer clip with a noncircular cross section. Claims 278-29 depend from amended claim 15 and presently distinguish over the combination of Faso, Rinner and Ritchey as well.

In view of the foregoing, The Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the objections and rejections and allowance of Claims 1-29. The Examiner is cordially invited to telephone Applicant's agent if it appears a telephone discussion would help resolve any outstanding matters or place the application in even better condition for allowance. Please charge any required fees to the Deposit Account of record.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Colin L. Cini
Agent for Applicant
Reg. No. 51,563

Telephone: 860-557-1329
Facsimile: 860-557-8614